	Case 2:10-cr-00319-JCM-PAL Docume	ent 58 Filed 03/31/14 Page 1 of 2	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	DISTRIC	ICT OF NEVADA	
8	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	2:10-CR-319 JCM (PAL)	
9	Plaintiff(s),		
10			
11	V.		
12	PARKER ENLOE,		
13	Defendant(s).		
14			
15		ORDER	
16	Presently before the court is defendant	at Parker Enloe's motion to modify the court's order of	
17	restitution. (Doc. # 52). The government filed a response in opposition (doc. # 54), and defendant		
18	filed a reply (doc. # 55).		
19	On July 16, 2010, defendant pleaded guilty to a single count of conspiracy to commit wire		
20	fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1349. (Doc. # 6). On January 18, 2013, defendant was sentenced		
21	to one month of incarceration followed by five years of supervised release. (Doc. #44). On April 15,		
22	2013, the court held a restitution hearing and ordered that defendant pay \$839,047.01, specifically		
23	stating that the payment amounts could be adjusted by the probation officer based on defendant's		
24	ability to pay. (Doc. # 48).		
25	Defendant now requests that the restitution amount be reduced in consideration of his minor		
26	role in the conspiracy and because his earnings have decreased due to his status as a convicted felon.		
27			
28			
James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge			

Case 2:10-cr-00319-JCM-PAL Document 58 Filed 03/31/14 Page 2 of 2

The court is not persuaded by either of defendant's arguments. The court was fully informed
as to the scope of defendant's participation in the conspiracy prior to issuing the judgment in this
matter. (Doc. #51). Defendant pleaded guilty to participating in four fraudulent transactions, and the
restitution order was based upon the value of those transactions. Defendant puts forward no evidence
indicating that there was a miscalculation as to the loss amount in the transactions in which he
participated.
Furthermore, defendant's second argument is misplaced, as the order of restitution is not

Furthermore, defendant's second argument is misplaced, as the order of restitution is not based upon his level of income, but instead upon the loss he caused through his criminal acts. If defendant is unable to afford the required periodic payments, he may request that the schedule be adjusted based on his ability to pay. However, the total amount of restitution shall remain the same.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, DECREED that defendant Parker Enloe's motion to modify the court's order of restitution (doc. # 52) is DENIED.

DATED March 31, 2014.

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE